DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 883 IR 051 393

AUTHOR Nuby, Mary
TITLE Collection Development Project.
INSTITUTION Chicago State Univ., Ill.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Higher Education; *Library Administration; *Library Collection Development; *Library Cooperation; Library Material Selection; *Library Planning; Library Research; Library Surveys; Policy Formation

ABSTRACT

Undertaken to provide data on the current status of collection development in selected academic libraries, this study also analyzed the structure of the collection development function at Chicago Academic Library Council (CALC) institutions and outlined a formal collection development policy for Chicago State University's Douglas Library. Questionnaires based on the Association of Research Libraries' 1974 survey were mailed to the eight CALC libraries; completed surveys were received from seven institutions. This document provides an introduction which includes brief discussions of the purpose of the study, its methodology and scope, and an overview of CALC; a summary of the survey results; and an outline of a proposed collection development policy for Douglas Library. A bibliography includes citations on methodologies and procedures used in the collection development process. The survey instrument is appended. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OERI
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official position or policy.

FD264883

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Nuby
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mary Nuby
Head, Catalog Department
Douglas Library
Chicago State University

1985

IR051393

ABSTRACT

This document is the result of a study that was undertaken to identify the current status of collection development in selected academic libraries. It analyzes the structure of the collection development function in the seven Chicago Academic Library Council institutions and outlines a collection development policy for Chicago State University's Douglas Library.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This study was undertaken to provide data on the current status of collection development in selected academic libraries. A related objective was to analyze the structure of the collection development function at these libraries. The third objective was to outline a formal collection development policy for the Douglas Library.

Methodology and Scope

This document summarizes data collected from a survey of collection development activities at the Chicago Academic Library Council institutions. Questionnaires based on the Association of Research Libraries' 1974 survey were mailed to the eight CALC libraries. Completed surveys were received from seven institutions; one library did not respond to the survey but forwarded a copy of its collection development guidelines. An outline of a collection development policy, incorporating the American Library Association's 1979 guidelines was adapted for the Douglas Library. The appended bibliography includes citations of methodologies and procedures used in the collection development process.

Overview of CALC

The directors of eight local academic libraries formed CALC in 1976. The CALC institutions include Chicago State, De Paul, Governors State, the Illinois Institute of Technology, Loyola, Northeastern, Roosevelt and the University of Illinois at Chicago. Reciprocal borrowing among these institutions was initiated in 1976. During the past eight years, CALC has sprouted specialized subcommittees to cover various aspects of library work. The Council provides a welcome forum for sharing plans and ideas

relating to library activities. Because of Chicago State University Library's affiliation with CALC, it was thought appropriate to limit the collection development survey to these institutions.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT SURVEY
CALC LIBRARIES
(SUMMARY OF RESULTS)

Five of the libraries surveyed have structured the collection development function through a separate position, a committee, or both. Collection development officers have been appointed at Chicago State and the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Collection development committees have been established at four of the institutions surveyed. The committee is chaired by Acquisitions Department librarians at De Paul, Loyola and Northeastern. Chicago State's Collection Development Librarian chairs the committee. At two of these four institutions, specifically, Chicago State and Northeastern, the Collection Development Committee is appointed by the University Librarian. The librarians/bibliographers of each subject group select a representative to De Paul's Collection Development Committee. Open membership to all librarians is offered at Northeastern. Committee membership at each institution is composed exclusively of librarians.

The process of selection is shared in varying degrees between the teaching faculty and the collection development committee at each of the the four institutions. Roosevelt reported that faculty members are exclusively responsible for selection within their departmental allocations. Librarians serve as liaisons to faculty for each academic department at Loyola. Here, the degree of faculty participation is reportedly to a large extent. De Paul also indicates that faculty are involved to a large extent in the selection process. Northeastern and Chicago State faculty participate to a large extent and to some extent, respectively.

As illustrated in the following table, reference librarians, on the average, have more influence in the selection process than any other group. Acquisitions librarians are ranked second. The third level of influence is shared equally among catalog librarians, serials librarians, and teaching faculty. Responses indicated that library directors exert less influence in materials selection than other groups. Collection development librarians/committees were excluded from the summary because of insufficient data.

DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTION POWER BY INSTITUTION	Chicago State	De Paul	Governors State	Loyola	Northeastern	Roosevelt	U of I at Chicago	MEAN
Collection Development Librarians	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collection Development Committee	2	4	-	3	3	-	-	-
Acquisitions Librarians	3	4	2	2	3	4	-	3
Reference Librarians	3	4	3	3	3	3	-	3.16
Catalog Librarians	2	4	3	2	1	4	-	2.66
Serials Librarians	2	4	2	2	3	3	-	2.66
Library Director	1	4	2	2	2	2	-	2.1
Faculty	2	3	2	3	2	4	-	2.66

Replicating variables from the preceding table, libraries were asked to identify personnel responsible for formulation of the collection development policy. De Paul, Governors State and Northeastern responded to this question. Librarians at these institutions exerted the same or more influence in structuring the collection development policy as in selecting materials. Faculty participation remained the same at one institution, increased slightly at another and disappeared altogether at the third institution.

Two of the libraries surveyed indicated that they employ a formula for allocation of the materials budget. At Governors State, "divisional allocations are based on institutional factors (student credit hours, majors, program status), publishing factors (output costs), and collection use." Northeastern has devised a formula using the Higher Education General Information Survey's academic subject thesaurus and other subject-oriented statistical data. This is a deviation from more traditional budgetary allocation formulas which are based on academic departments.

Four of the CALC libraries have written collection development policies. Two of these libraries indicated that their documents are out of date or in the process of revision. (One of the libraries did not respond to the survey but sent a copy of the collection development policy). De Paul and Northeastern have formal collection development policies that are currently being used. At De Paul, this document is used primarily as a guide for the selection of materials. Secondarily, it serves as a decision guide for the allocation of funds. The collection development policy at Northeastern is used mainly to clarify the library's collection goals and objectives. Next, the document serves as a guide for the selection of materials.

A collection development policy's main objective appears to determine its format and content. For example, De Paul indicates that its policy is used mainly as a selection guide. In support of this purpose, their collection development policy delineates collection objectives for each of the university's academic disciplines. The document incorporates a network of cross references to areas of related interest. Northeastern, on the other hand, lists the main purpose of its collection development policy as defining the library's collection goals and objectives. Here, the collection development policy is rather general in scope.

At this point, no formal plans for cooperative collection development have been instituted at any of the CALC libraries. These institutions, however, share their collections through reciprocal borrowing and the CALC Shared Serials Project. One respondee noted that holdings on LCS (an online system listing holdings of 22 Illinois libraries) are taken into account in purchasing decisions.

Three CALC libraries have made attempts to systematically evaluate collections, at least in part. Chicago State's recent evaluation of business periodicals titles was based on a citation analysis of the titles in local indexing sources. De Paul evaluated its collection in terms of desired future growth when revising their collection development policy. The University of Illinois at Chicago used the collection management program of the Association of Research Libraries in its collection evaluation undertaking.

PROPOSED
COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICY OUTLINE
FOR
DOUGLAS LIBRARY

I. General statement on collection objectives of the library

A. Clientele

1. Chicago State students

2. Chicago State faculty, administration and staff

3. Academic affiliates

a. CALC

b. LCS

B. General subject boundaries of the collection

C. Kinds of programs and user needs supported

1. Curriculum

a. undergraduate

b. graduate

2. Faculty research

3. General library science collection in support of daily operations

4. General informational needs of all clientele

D. General priorities and limitations governing selection

1. Degree of continuing support for strong collections

2. Forms of materials collected or excluded

a. monographs

b. textbook (excluding Materials Center collection)

c. government documents

d. printed music

e. pamphlets

f. serials

1) periodicals

2) newspapers

3) annuals

4) looseleaf services

g. theses

h. tests

i. workbooks and study guides

j. curriculum guides

k. microforms

l. annual reports

II. Responsibilities of Collection Development Committee

A. Selecting materials

B. Evaluating collection

C. Monitoring new programs and lobbying for monies to support the same

D. Encouraging faculty to actively participate in the collection development process

E. Weeding

F. Evaluating gift materials

G. Binding decisions (excluding the systematic binding of periodicals)

III. Collection objectives of special collections

A. Government Documents Center collection

B. Materials Center collection

C. A-V

D. Archives

E. Others as defined by Collection Development Committee

IV. Detailed analysis of desired level of collecting intensity for each subject or academic discipline

The collection levels that follow are defined in Guidelines for Collection Development, published by the American Library Association in 1979. Using Chicago State University's graduate and undergraduate bulletins as a guide, each academic discipline should be evaluated separately.

A. Advanced study level. A collection which is adequate to support the course work of advanced undergraduate and master's degree programs, or sustained independent study; that is, which is adequate to maintain knowledge of a subject required for limited or generalized purposes, of less than research intensity. It includes a wide range of basic monographs both current and retrospective, complete collections of the works of more important writers, selections from the works of secondary writers, a selection of representative journals, and the reference tools and fundamental bibliographical apparatus pertaining to the subject.

B. Initial study level. A collection which is adequate to support undergraduate courses. It includes a judicious selection from currently published basic monographs (as are represented by Choice selections) supported by seminal retrospective monographs (as are represented by Books for College Libraries); a broad selection of works of more important writers; a selection of the most significant works of secondary writers; a selection of the major review journals; and current editions of the most significant reference sources and bibliographies pertaining to the subject.

C. Basic level. A highly selective collection which serves to introduce and define the subject and to indicate the varieties of information available elsewhere. It includes major dictionaries and encyclopedias, selected editions of important works, historical surveys, important bibliographies, and a few major periodicals in the field.

D. Minimal level. A subject area in which few selections are made beyond very basic works.

E. Not collected. Items in these subject fields are completely out of scope for a library's collections.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acquisition Policies. SPEC Kit 12 Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, 1974.

American Library Association. Collection Development Committee. "Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies." Library Resources and Technical Services 21:41-48 (1977).

Baughman, James C. "Toward a Structural Approach to Collection Development." College and Research Libraries 38:241-48 (1977).

Bonk, Wallace and Magrill Rose Mary. Building Library Collections. 5th ed. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1979.

Bonn, George S. "Evaluation of the Collection." Library Trends 22:265-304 (1974).

Burr, Robert L. "Evaluating Library Collections: A Case Study. "The Journal of Academic Librarianship 5:256-60 (1979).

Cassata, Mary B. and Dewey, Gene L. "The Evaluation of a University Library Collection: Some Guidelines." Library Resources and Technical Services 13:450-57 (1969).

Clapp, Verner W. and Jordan, Robert T. Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections." College and Research Libraries 26:371-80 (Sept. 1965).

Cline, Hugh F. and Sinnott, Loraine T. Building Library Collections. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Co., 1981.

Collection Assessment. SPEC Kit 41. Washington,D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, 1978.

De Paul University Libraries. Collection Development Policy. Chicago: The Library, 1983.

Dickinson, Dennis W. "A Rationalist's Critique of Book Selection for Academic Libraries." The Journal of Academic Librarianship 7:138-143 (1981).

Gold, Steven D. "Allocating the Book Budget: an Economic Model." College and Research Libraries 36:397-402 (Sept. 1975).

Golden, Barbara. "A Method for Quantitatively Evaluating a University Library Collection." Library Resources and Technical Services 18:268-74 (1974).

Goldstein, Marianne and Sedransk, Joseph. "Using a Sample Technique to Describe Characteristics of a Collection." College and Research Libraries 38:195-202 (1977).

Illinois Institute of Technology [Library]. Collection Development Policy [Draft]. Chicago: The Library, 1982.

McGrath, William E. "An Allocation Formula Derived from a Factor Analysis of Academic Departments." College and Research Libraries 30:51-62 (Jan. 1964).

McGrath, William E. "The Significance of Books Used According to a Classified Profile of Academic Departments." College and Research Libraries 33:212-19 (1972).

Morse, Philip M. "Measures of Library Effectiveness." Library Quarterly 51:15-30 (1972).

Nisonger, Thomas E. "An In-Depth Collection Evaluation at the University of Manitoba Library: A Test of the Lopez Method." Library Resources and Technical Services 24:329-38 (1980).

Northeastern University Library. Library Acquisitions Policy. Chicago: The Library, 1974.

Reed, Jutta R. "Collection Analysis in MIT Libraries." New Horizons for Academic Libraries, pp.490-495 (1979).

User Surveys and Evaluation of Library Services. SPEC Kit 71. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, 1981.

Van Orden, Phyllis and Phillips, Edith B. Background Readings in Building Library Collections. 2d ed. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1979.

APPENDIX

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT SURVEY
CALC LIBRARIES

Please return to:

Mary Q. Nuby
Chicago State University Library
95th Street at King Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60628

Name of Library _____

Name and Title of Respondent _____

1) Does your library have a separate collection development office/function?

( ) no

( ) yes ---- a) who administers this function?

name: _____

title: _____

b) briefly describe his/her role in the collection development process (or include copy of existing job descriptions.

2) Does your library have a collection development committee or committee?

( ) no

( ) yes ---- a) Who (title) chairs the committee(s)?

b) Briefly describe the role of the committee in the collection development process (include copies of existing documentation such as committee objectives, committee reports, etc.):

_____

_____

_____

c) Who (title) appoints the committee members?

_____

d) Are all of the committee members professional librarians?

( ) yes

( ) no

If no, please categorize other committee members by placing an "X" on the appropriate line.

Teaching Faculty _____ Other (please specify) _____

3) To what extent do the following select materials for the library collections?

( ) not at all ( ) to some extent

( ) to a large extent ( ) exclusively

a) Librarians who are assigned to a separate collection development unit _____

b) Members of the library's collection development committee _____

c) Acquisition department librarians _____

d) Reference department librarians _____

e) Catalog department librarians _____

f) Serials department librarians _____

g) Library Director _____

h) Faculty _____

i) Other)please specify) _____

4) Does your library employ a formula for the allocation of the materials budget?

( ) no

( ) yes

If yes, briefly describe or attach relevant documentation:

_____

_____

_____

_____

5) Does your library use the Acquisitions subsystem of OCLC?

( ) no

( ) yes

If using OCLC has impacted on your allocation of funds, please briefly indicate how.

_____

_____

_____

_____

6) Does your library have a written collection development/acquisitions policy statement?

( ) no

( ) yes

a) When was the copy written? _____

_____

b) When was it last revised? _____

_____

c) Does your library have a mechanism for updating or revising the policy?

( ) no

( ) yes (If yes, please describe or attach relevant documentation)

_____

_____

_____

_____

7) To what extent did the following participate in the formulation of the collection development policy?

(1) not at all (2) to some extent

(3) to a large extent (4) exclusively

a) Librarians who are assigned to a separate collection development unit _____

b) Members of the library's collection development committee _____

c) Acquisition department librarians _____

d) Reference department librarians _____

e) Catalog department librarians _____

f) Serials department librarians _____

g) Library Director _____

h) Faculty _____

i) Other (please specify) _____

8) How would you rank your library's current uses of the collection development policy? (Assign No. 1 to the most important)

( ) serves as a guide for selection of materials

( ) serves as decision guide for allocation of book funds

( ) clarifies or applies library's collection goals and objectives

( ) demonstrates library's needs to funding sources

( ) clarify library collection policy to users

( ) not currently used because out-of-date, too general, etc.

( ) other (please specify) _____

_____

9) Is your library involved in any cooperative collection development program (s) with other libraries?

( ) no

( ) yes

If yes, briefly describe or supply relevant documentation:

_____

_____

_____

_____

10) Has your library attempted to evaluate systematically its collection or a portion of it?

( ) no

( ) yes

If yes, briefly describe the process and/or supply relevant documentation:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____